

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

13391

FOIAb3b

know the American State Department is not just looking for an easy way out in its dealings with the nations of the world, but I do not think the world knows it. And only the State Department can convince the world this Nation has a firm foreign policy; that we intend to lead to freedom those nations which want freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
Administration of foreign affairs  
Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Department of State, not otherwise provided for, including expenses authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801-1158), not otherwise provided for; expenses necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in Germany (including those arising under the supreme authority assumed by the United States on June 5, 1945, and under contractual arrangements with the Federal Republic of Germany); salary of the United States member of the Board for the Validation of German bonds in the United States at the rate of \$17,100 per annum; expenses of the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946 (22 U.S.C. 2870, 287g, 287r); purchase (not to exceed sixteen, of which four are for replacement only) or hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding outside the continental United States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); purchase of uniforms; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than to others; employment of aliens by contract for services abroad; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for passports; radio communications; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and similar services abroad; care and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane; expenses, as authorized by law (18 U.S.C. 3192), of bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons charged with crime; and procurement by contract or otherwise, of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1) translating, (2) analysis and tabulation of technical information, and (3) preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids; \$140,710,000, of which not less than \$12,000,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That passenger motor vehicles in possession of the Foreign Service abroad may be replaced in accordance with section 7 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 891), and the cost, including the exchange allowance, of each such replacement shall not exceed \$3,800 in the case of the chief of mission automobile at each diplomatic mission (except that eight such vehicles may be purchased at not to exceed \$7,800 each) and \$1,500 in the case of all other such vehicles except station wagons.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] had the floor he ran out of time. I was asking certain

questions about Public Law 87-256. I would like to pursue this subject a bit further. As I understand the law—I am reading here, it says:

U.S. representation in international artistic, dramatic, musical, sports, and other cultural festivals, competitions, meetings and like exhibitions and assemblies.

Is there any doubt in the gentleman's mind that this international parachuting championship is included within this law and that funds could be provided for it by the State Department if they saw fit?

Mr. BOW. I think the very broad language of this bill takes in most anything. We have included the World's Fair in New York, and other items of that kind, and I think, yes, it would undoubtedly cover that.

Mr. CONTE. I must say I regret, and I am somewhat distressed to learn some of the things that have happened under this law. The State Department brings a jazz band from Warsaw to the United States under the auspices of this law. Mr. Chairman, we asked the State Department to bring these 24 nations here to the United States to compete in this international contest, and we requested \$100,000. We were not asking the Department to pay their airplane fare over here. We were only asking for money to conduct this meet itself.

This is ridiculous. Very soon the representatives of these countries are coming over here. Let me read some of them: Australia, Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, India, Poland, Rumania, Russia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, and the United States will participate in this meet.

When I could not get money for that, then I went to the Defense Department to try to obtain some tents and bedding. I was promised by the Defense Department that they would cooperate, but only yesterday I learned we cannot get the tents and cots unless we get enabling legislation through the Congress. Time is of the essence.

It is disgraceful to think of all these people coming over here, these teams of five men from each country and we do not have tents and bedding to accommodate them. We spend billions of dollars to try to win the hearts and minds of men all over the world, yet in this case we are asking for only \$100,000 from the State Department and they will not give it to us. The Defense Department will not give us even tents or cots or communications systems to take care of this important world competition.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say that I know of the strenuous efforts the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has made in trying to get the State Department to cooperate insofar as this parachuting contest which is to take place up at Orange, Mass., is concerned. He discussed this matter with me some time back. The State Department or those in control did not see fit to send a budget estimate to the committee, so that the committee is now

and has been in the position where we do not have a budget estimate or a request for funds for this parachute contest. Again I say I know how hard and how long the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts worked on this project.

Mr. CONTE. I want the record to show that I certainly appreciate everything the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Ohio tried to do for me. They realize the predicament we are in.

On this matter there has been a resolution passed by the U.S. Congress, signed by President Eisenhower and pushed through the Senate by the then Senator Kennedy, inviting the nations over here. It is ridiculous, it is a shame for them to come at all when we do not have a tent or a cot for the participants to use. We are using a school building, yet we do not have cots to put in the school, so that they can sleep there. At the same time we are bringing these jazz bands from Warsaw to kick up their heels and spend the taxpayers' hard-earned money. We send abroad comedians, who put on a disgraceful performance that hurts the image of the United States with other countries—the very countries we are trying to win over to our side.

I hope the President of the United States will read the RECORD tomorrow morning and answer my appeal for help in this situation.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I feel I should bring to the attention of the committee some additional information on the subject discussed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] a little while ago, with reference to Roger Hilsman.

I do so because I know Mr. Hilsman. I have a high regard for him, and I know that he is making a significant contribution to our knowledge of an important area, southeast Asia. I was not present at the discussion in the committee to which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] referred, and I do not attempt to discuss what happened there with authority. But I do feel that it will be well if I read into the RECORD a letter which Mr. Hilsman sent to me after I had asked him for some explanation of the misunderstanding between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and himself, both of whom I regard very highly.

Here is what he said:

JULY 20, 1962.

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SIKES: This is in response to your request for an explanation of the misunderstanding between Mr. Bow and me.

Mr. Bow and I were discussing the "external research" program. In this program the State Department signs contracts with experts in a university or private business to do a study that the State Department needs but cannot do itself, usually because the study requires special skills.

Mr. Bow and I were discussing off the record one particular study, on the Communists' use of guerrilla warfare as a means of aggression. Mr. Bow, as he said in the report, did not have time to read the study.

since it was the size of a small book, but in glancing at it, saw one statement with which he did not agree.

This was a statement of judgment not of facts which as I recall characterized a foreign government as "highly unstable" and therefore vulnerable to Communist guerrilla warfare.

I agreed with Mr. Bow that this judgment might have gone too far. He asked me if the statement was not therefore a "half-truth" and I said that if you prefer that language it could be used.

Our further discussion on the record, used this unfortunate phrase "half-truth." But what I was trying to say is as follows:

An outside contractor offers his best judgments, as he is hired to do, and this is good. I might not agree with every single judgment that every one of our contractors makes, but it would destroy the value of getting outside research and judgments if we forced outside contractors to clear their work in advance with all the Bureaus of the State Department and modify them accordingly before submitting the final study.

This particular study, in fact, has been enormously useful. It shows how the Communists are trying to use guerrilla warfare to conquer nations friendly to the United States. It has helped to alert our Government to a Communist threat. It has furnished some valuable ideas on how we should meet this threat. Some of the suggestions in this study are being used today with good effect against the Communists in South Vietnam. The study is used today by our Armed Forces to alert our soldiers to the Communist threat of guerrilla warfare and how to fight it.

After the misunderstanding with Mr. Bow developed I tried several times to get to see him to explain all this. I am sure that once he has heard the full story he would agree that both this particular study and the external research program that made it possible are valuable assets in the struggle our country faces.

Sincerely,

ROGER HILSMAN.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida reading that letter into the record, and I am glad to know the extent to which Mr. Hilsman has gone to try to create a personal feeling on my part against him or that we had some point of disagreement. That is as far from the truth as it can be. I was objecting because he, in his own testimony, said that his secret reports to the President and the Secretary of State contained half-truths and partial half-truths, probably from people who said it to them. There is no disagreement about whether that is in the record or out of the record. When we go back into the House I am going to ask permission to include that testimony following the letter that has been read so that you can see exactly what the testimony was and that this is a matter that there is no disagreement on. I am not trying to attack Mr. Hilsman. I understand he has a magnificent war record. He was a guerrilla fighter and probably a great patriot. My objection is the fact that he invited these people in from the outside, using money to get experts. Why do they not have them in the State Department? That is where they are supposed to have experts on intelligence, on things of this kind. But they are bringing in these people from the outside saying they do not have to be cleared and putting in

half-truths and partial-truths and are not valid in some respects. If that is the position upon which our foreign policy is decided, no wonder we are in the position we are in now in this particular area with which this report had to do, southeast Asia. What is the situation there today as compared to what it used to be? Are we in worse shape now because of the half-truths and partial-truths and invalid statements upon which our policy has been made by the Department of State? Now, we have not cleared up any situation in southeast Asia, and that is the question of this guerrilla warfare.

The same things are in here. Mr. Hilsman has tried his best. He has had distinguished Members on the other side of the aisle and distinguished Members on this side of the aisle trying to arrange for him to come in and get this straightened up. But you cannot change this record. The record is here, and I ask every Member who is interested in the question of foreign policy to read the Record tomorrow with this testimony in it and determine for himself what kind of language this is and whether this is a personal feud or not.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I feel that I must comment on the gentleman's reference to conditions in southeast Asia. I feel very strongly that there has been improvement in that area, that for the first time since trouble began in South Vietnam, the forces of that country are beginning to push back the Viet Cong. Over a period of years the Viet Cong had been steadily expanding their operations—and their control of territory. They were rapidly increasing their numbers, doubling in strength about every 9 months. Now as the result of a stronger policy on the part of this Nation in foreign affairs, and a more realistic policy on the part of the Vietnamese Government that picture has begun to change. For the first time the Viet Cong forces in South Vietnam are being pushed back. They are finding it harder and harder to obtain supplies. The villagers are being encouraged to resist the Viet Cong, and they are doing so in more and more instances.

Mr. BOW. I would like to remind the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] now that for the first time in the last few weeks the casualty list of American boys are beginning to come in from southeast Asia and that there is a change. There is a change in casualty lists.

Mr. SIKES. Because the Vietnamese forces are fighting more realistically and more aggressively than at any time heretofore. Our forces are there as advisers. Their presence at this time is essential to victory. If we pull them out, the gentleman knows very well South Vietnam is going down the drain and that would be another victory for communism. Our forces are exposed to danger, and I deplore the fact that it is necessary that they be exposed to danger, but we are now beginning to win that conflict. There is no other course for victory.

But as a result the forces of democracy are winning in the world for a change.

Mr. BOW. I am sure that the gentleman will agree with me that it is not proper to establish our foreign policy on reports of half truths and partial truths and some which cannot be valid.

Mr. SIKES. I am not defending the passage in the hearings to which the gentleman referred. I simply read into the Record a letter addressed to me from Mr. Hilsman which showed that he felt there had been a misunderstanding and that he wanted an opportunity to try to clear up that misunderstanding.

Mr. BOW. There could be no misunderstanding because of the language used, and it can be read in the Record, for the benefit of those who are interested:

#### POLICY RESEARCH STUDIES

Mr. Bow. Who reads these policy research studies, one of which I am holding in my hand marked "secret"?

Mr. HILSMAN. That particular one the President has seen.

Mr. Bow. Did it frighten him?

Mr. HILSMAN. I am not guaranteeing he read it. I know he is aware of the contents.

Mr. Bow. But who in your Department reads these?

Mr. HILSMAN. The Secretary of State has read it.

Mr. Bow. Was he frightened after he read it?

Mr. HILSMAN. In what way, sir?

Mr. Bow. The way I am frightened when I read it. We are in awful bad shape.

Mr. HILSMAN. Let us say we certainly can improve, sir, and I think we are.

(Off the record.)

Mr. Bow. Hurriedly going through the policy research study, I can find nothing of any real substance which I believe contributes to the peace of the world or to a sound foreign policy for this country. I would like to tell you, if we can, on the record, just how much good this has done.

Mr. HILSMAN. Sir, I think it has done a lot of good.

Mr. Bow. Where?

Mr. HILSMAN. If you will look on the first page past the letter where it says, "Major conclusions and findings," the first one is that "The key to fighting guerrillas is to adopt the tactics of the guerrillas themselves."

Mr. Bow. Now we are reading from a secret document. Are you opening this document up so I may use it publicly?

Mr. HILSMAN. May I supply you with an unclassified, sanitized version of this?

Mr. Bow. What does sanitized mean? Do you have one that is sane and this is not sane?

Mr. HILSMAN. Sanitary.

Mr. Bow. Cleaned up?

Mr. HILSMAN. Cleaned up, meaning removing—

Mr. Bow. I did not know whether you were putting sanity or sanitation into it.

Mr. HILSMAN. Sanitation in the sense of cleaning it up.

Mr. Bow. It is a rather remarkable thing that you want to submit to us something which has been cleaned up. You mean by that, something classified should be taken out?

Mr. HILSMAN. Yes, information which was acquired through sensitive sources.

Mr. Bow. Were the things I just read to you, do you think, classified?

Mr. HILSMAN. Some of them may have been, sir. I would have to check.

Mr. Bow. Go ahead.

Mr. HILSMAN. Sir, let us take this one, the first one, "The key to fighting guerrillas is to adopt the tactics of the guerrillas themselves."

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

13393

First of all, I think this is fundamentally true. Perhaps I could make this point by telling you an anecdote. I was in Burma during World War II, and a guerrilla myself, operating behind the enemy lines. At one stage we had blown up bridges and ambushed trucks. During the middle of a rather large battle, the Japanese took 3,000 men out of the line of combat to chase this guerrilla unit.

Mr. BOW. This was where?

Mr. HILSMAN. In Burma, in World War II, an OSS guerrilla unit I commanded. The point was that this Japanese unit fought as regiments and battalions against guerrillas. They were the trained soldiers and we were not. I remember once they moved their battalions into a U-shaped trap, and then tried to chivvy my OSS group up into this trap. We just went off into the jungle and faded away. They closed the trap on air. At the end of a month of this, the Japanese had suffered over 100 casualties and the OSS guerrilla group had suffered only 1. It was not because they were not better soldiers than we were. They were, in fact, much better soldiers than we were. But they did not adopt tactics which were suitable to fighting guerrillas.

Mr. BOW. Do you think this document has to do with fighting guerrillas?

Mr. HILSMAN. Yes, sir; it certainly does.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Then it is a defense paper.

Mr. HILSMAN. It is not a defense paper precisely because the key to fighting guerrillas is basically political. If you do not adapt your military tactics to political measures or measures of civic action, you will fail. In this particular instance, for example, which I mentioned, if the Japanese had adopted the correct military tactics and coupled them with certain civic actions, they would not have failed. This, I think, is the fundamental point about fighting guerrillas, and it is why we moved into this field, because no one that we could tell, and we checked this out—

Mr. BOW. With your experience and background in this, why did you not write the memorandum, instead of having this outsider come in and write these things about our country?

Mr. HILSMAN. I helped write it, sir.

Mr. BOW. You did not write the things I read to you.

Mr. HILSMAN. No, sir. There are a couple of points to this. One is that we want to do this as a supplement. This particular man used some expertise inside the Department, including some of my own and some of my own experiences. The second thing about it—

Mr. ROONEY. Expertise is one of your favorite words, is it not?

Mr. HILSMAN. Yes, sir; I am sorry. It is a bad word, too. I agree with you. I cut it out of all the written things, but I fell into it, here.

Mr. ROONEY. You overlooked one here.

Mr. HILSMAN. I apologize. I will not use it any more.

The point I wanted to make here was that there is some utility in having a person write a document that is not fully cleared and does not have to go through the whole clearance process. Of course, some of the statements you have read are not completely valid. On the other hand, there may be a half-truth here or a partial truth which will make people sit up and think.

Mr. BOW. If I am sitting down in the State Department and this is given to me as a research study from the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, I should think I would have a right to believe this is not half-truth or partial truth and to be able to rely upon it. Is our foreign policy made on reports with "half-truths" or "partial truths"; that is pretty dangerous.

Mr. HILSMAN. It should make you think and it should have some findings which are

useful if, in your judgment and in your own experience—

Mr. BOW. Do you mean to tell me in order to get the people in the State Department to think, we have to feed them half-truths? I do not agree with that. I would hope they are much more intelligent than that down there.

Mr. HILSMAN. May I point out in the letter of transmittal of this, I stated that it was done by a consultant working full time with the help of specialists within the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. "Our intention was to provide research that would be a useful input," but it was not necessarily to be the last word.

Mr. BOW. Where does it say that?

Mr. HILSMAN. I am sorry sir, in the letter of transmittal.

Mr. BOW. It does not say it is not to be the last word.

Mr. HILSMAN. No.

Mr. BOW. You started to quote from the letter. You did not have a chance to put your quotation marks where they should be. You read some pretty good language but it is not in that letter. You probably should have put that into the original letter. It is not there. If I were in the Department of State and read your original letter, I would take it this is something I could rely upon as being factual, not half-truth.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the consideration of this bill during the general debate the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] mentioned and read into the Record a letter from a Mrs. Adams which was dated in 1784 describing the difficulties of John Quincy Adams as Ambassador to France. In that recitation she indicated the debt that this country owed to him because of the fact that he had saved our fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that as far as I know he is the only Ambassador or anyone who followed the policies of our State Department who saved any of our fisheries.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Washington, on behalf of the gentleman from Ohio and myself, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and all the members of this subcommittee, that we have done plenty to save the fisheries. There is plenty of fish money right now in this bill.

Mr. PELLY. I was referring in the policies of our State Department and our Ambassadors. I would particularly refer to the fact that no Ambassador who ever represented this country in Japan was able to save our fisheries, because all we have done is build up and help the fisheries of foreign governments while these foreign nations, in turn, competed with us and through imports ruined our own industry and the fishermen who were earning a livelihood through that means.

Mr. Chairman, I might add that this year in Alaska the salmon pack, for ex-

ample, is only about half what it was last year.

All during recent years the Japanese have fished in the North Pacific with nets, taking immature salmon while our own American fishermen could not use such nets. I point this up because of the fact that I have had a conservation bill which I introduced 6 months ago on which the Merchant Marine Committee has not yet had reports from the Department of State or the other agencies concerned. Thus there has been a delay in holding a hearing and the Congress could not consider a means by which the United States might protect our own American fishermen and our own fishery resources.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(Mr. CORMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, the entertainment industry has come in for some adverse comment today. I could not say that there were not isolated instances where it was justified.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from California yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I should not like the distinguished gentleman from California to think that I have any animus toward the entertainment industry. I am one who has known something about it through the years. I worked in my college days as a union musician. If I were looking for a top-flight comedian, as I mentioned awhile ago, I would pick Buddy Hackett. In days gone by we had Joe Cook and his four Hawaiians; we had Fred Allen; we had Joe Penner and his duck; we had Eddie Cantor; we had many really top-notch comedians. If we must have a comedian to send abroad at the taxpayers' expense on a good will tour, for goodness sake, let us get a good one and not a ham to go abroad and make a "damphool" of himself and all of us.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly concur in what the gentleman has said. I do not pretend to be qualified to select individual performers nor comment on the specific instances criticized here. But the Record should show that the American entertainment industry has contributed substantially during both the hot wars of yesterday and the cold war of today to the strength of this Nation and to an understanding of democracy in many parts of the world.

The selfless contributions over the years of top stars such as Danny Kaye, Bob Hope, Benny Goodman, Carole Lombard, Ella Fitzgerald, Betty Hutton, and Glenn Miller should be remembered by those who indict the profession as selfish.

It seems elementary to me that American artists and entertainers provide a necessary ingredient of the American picture we are intent on presenting to the developing and contested parts of the world. Our form of government and economy is well known for its high productivity and high living standards and

is sometimes charged with being too preoccupied with gadgetry and creature comforts. Yet, this free society of ours has been equally productive in the creative arts, the theater, and music. We can be proud of artists of the caliber of Isaac Stern, Igor Stravinsky, and Helen Hayes, and groups such as the University of Michigan Symphonic Band and the Alvin Ailey Dance Group who have let millions of people around the world see this side of our Nation.

In addition to the words of criticism directed on this floor today toward many of the personalities involved, I am hopeful my colleagues and the public will read the comments of newspapers around the world evidencing the goodwill created by this program.

The athletic feats of our young men and women participating in this program are a forceful answer to anti-American propaganda abroad that we are "a soft people living in a decadent society."

It has been implied that entertainers, unlike all other professional people hired by the Government, should work without compensation. This hardly seems more logical than to contend that doctors, dentists, and engineers should serve their country without compensation because they are professionals. The record discloses that in most instances professional artists, like all other professional people, sacrifice a part of their salary when they work for the Government. Further, I doubt that any profession has contributed as much in free talent over the years as have star performers.

As to the total cost of the program, \$2½ million is a lot of money. But on a comparative basis, it is to be noted that it is about as much as this Government spends annually on maintenance of the Senate Office Building and about one-fiftieth—not fifth—of the cost of maintaining one B-52 bomber wing for 1 year.

I respectfully submit that we would be denying ourselves of an important weapon in this crucial competition should we neglect this program.

I, for one, salute the artists who have contributed to it.

(Mr. CORMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, with respect to several remarks that have been made on the floor this afternoon relative to the cultural exchange activities. About a year ago this House and the Congress rewrote the law providing for cultural exchange programs. It is my purpose this afternoon to try to discover a little more specifically if I can how much money is in this bill for these exchange programs and for what purposes it is available.

Mr. ROONEY. There is included \$40 million. That is the exact amount, as I recall, and I was Chairman of the Committee of the Whole in this Chamber at the time that the gentleman from Indi-

ana assured the Committee of the Whole would be the overall cost of the consolidated cultural exchange programs.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman is correct; that was the figure that was given by representatives of the State Department to the subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield further at that point?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman from Indiana familiar with the fact that at the very time that that figure of \$40 million was given to the gentleman and to the members of his Foreign Affairs Committee there was in the works, in the Department of State, a request that would have brought the program up to about \$91 million a year?

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is now familiar with that; he was not at the time the hearings were being held. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York further if the evidence before his subcommittee indicated that this sum of \$40 million would do an adequate job in the field of exchange of persons and educational and cultural activities.

Mr. ROONEY. I should fairly say in reply that when it came to the markup with regard to this item I suggested a figure in excess of \$40 million; but this figure of \$40 million represents the considered judgment of all the members of the subcommittee during the course of the markup, during which all the pros and cons were discussed. In other words, representing the subcommittee, I should say to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana that the committee feels that this will furnish an ample program in fiscal year 1963.

Mr. ADAIR. As I read the record of the hearings and the report, I gather that the request was more in the neighborhood of \$56 million.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the gentleman realizes that, as pointed out at page 8 of the committee report, in addition to the funds that are in this item, to wit, \$40 million, the Department plans to utilize an additional \$8,043,798, which is available from the unexpended balance of prior-year appropriations for "International Educational Exchange activities—special foreign currency program."

Mr. ADAIR. So there is in effect \$48 million-plus available?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

Mr. ADAIR. For the sake of the record, what was the budget request for this item?

Mr. ROONEY. The budget request was in the amount of \$56,657,000.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, when my time expired in general debate I had started to ask a question concerning the cultural setup in Hawaii. I should like to know from one side of the aisle or the other whether we are going to continue to spend millions of dollars out there,

some of it in construction of new buildings, and not have title to the buildings or to the land on which the buildings are erected. Has this situation, which was discussed to some extent last year, been resolved?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman will perhaps recall that the gentleman from Ohio a year ago raised the question about the lack of title. The grants provided that we could be put out within 30 days. This has now been changed. This grant has been entered into and the title of the property has been properly researched, and we have an unlimited tenure of occupancy. So far as the gentleman from Ohio is concerned, the changes were made that now give us protection.

Mr. GROSS. Then the gentleman is satisfied now that whatever expenditures are made there the U.S. Government will be protected?

Mr. BOW. We will be protected, I am satisfied of that.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

I understand there is a reception center in Hawaii. There is also a reception center somewhere in California. I do not know whether it is in San Francisco or Los Angeles. For the life of me, I cannot understand why we maintain a reception center in California and another in Hawaii.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say that in both November and December of last year I inspected that reception center in Honolulu. There is a director, an assistant director, and just a few employees. The space used for the center could very well fit into just a corner of this Chamber. They were busy meeting foreign students, foreigners coming to Honolulu and the mainland under the exchange program, putting them up in private homes in Honolulu, and generally seeing that they were properly taken care of so that they might have a good impression of us.

Mr. GROSS. Recently it was brought to my attention—and I cannot get a complete fill-in on this for some reason or another from the State Department—that a gentleman by the name of Pershing Boswell, a Negro, was sent out to Hawaii as director of the reception center. Boswell, I am informed, has long years of experience. He is a career officer in the State Department.

Mr. ROONEY. A fine gentleman, a good Foreign Service officer, who has a charming wife. I have known him for years.

Mr. GROSS. Now I understand a gentleman by the name of Goemans has been sent out to head up this reception center.

Mr. ROONEY. He is a very competent young gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. And he is a friend of Teddy Kennedy.